

January 9, 1975

say that I would think that we could limit the activity of committees and that would probably be as effective as limiting an individual senator's responsibility. In addition to that you have the check, if you are going, you have the check of public repudiation or castigation if the senator is going to introduce a couple of hundred bills. I don't think there are that many irresponsible people here. We have internal checks, that is if the bills are frivolous or totally unnecessary, they can be disposed of rather quickly and efficiently but we don't have any check on bills now and we all know that and so why do we impose this restriction on a senator who might have eleven or twelve good bills and necessary bills. Probably has gotten some from senators who aren't going to carry any bills and who peddle bills, so I think Senator Chambers raises a good point, goes to the heart of some of our procedures and we probably ought to change the rule. I would suggest, though, that if we adopt Senator Chambers suggestion we also place a limitation of probably ten on committee bills.

PRESIDENT: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DeCAMP: Mr. President, the easy solution appeared at the time when this was passed. The easy solution to a problem of too many bills was simply to pass a limit, a law that imposed some--something on the entire body and we see that so frequently in laws passed in cities, counties, state and federal level. Some problem, so they pass some arbitrary solution that causes more harm than good. Now admittedly, restraint is certainly a virtuous thing under certain circumstances and certainly I think there is evidence that the unlimited amount of bills might have been abused by some people here in the past. That could have been corrected if the committees had functioned a little more efficiently in the way they handled things. A committee that saw a senator had an exorbitant number of bills of a variety of things could have handled those bills quite effectively and given the message to the senator, the individual senator, by disposing of those bills very rapidly and I think if we are going to maintain the integrity and ability of the committees that function efficiently, we should leave this authority, this responsibility, this duty with them. We shouldn't come and put a blanket rule on this body and tell members how many they can or cannot introduce. I use the word precedent because it does set a bad precedence. It sets a precedent that we use this solution today but tomorrow if something of a similar nature and they say it could go to one, That sounds ridiculous today. It isn't that ridiculous and so I would urge you to adopt the amendment realizing that you are accepting a duty then, both personal to limiting the number of bills you have to reason and only those things you sincerely believe need to be acted on or considered. A duty upon yourself to take as many things as you can and work with other senators to compose them into one bill rather than twelve bills, but most of all a duty upon the committees to seriously look at the bills that come before them and make an evaluation of whether this unlimited privilege is being abused. If it is the committees can correct it and should correct it. So, I would urge the adoption of the amendment.

PRESIDENT: Senator Koch.

SENATOR KOCH: Mr. President and members of the body, I object to any changes in the Rules other than adopting